

# A Johnson Doctrine?

## His Policy Seen as Not Differing Much In Practice From President Kennedy's

By TOM WICKER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 5—Has President Johnson proclaimed a new "Johnson Doctrine" for the Western Hemisphere?

The assumption that he has is based on his assertion last Sunday night that the American nations would not permit the establishment of another "Communist government" in

the Hemisphere.

That differs from

President John F.

Analysis Kennedy's fre-

quent assertions that "Soviet satellites" or nations following a "satellite role" could never be accepted among the American nations.

It differs because postwar history has demonstrated that not all "Communist governments" are "Soviet satellites" or play a "satellite role" for any other government.

But it does not differ much in practice, because any government committed to preventing the establishment of a "satellite" in its sphere of interest will not be able to wait to see if a "Communist government" is going to become someone's satellite. Once a Communist take-over threatens, it is likely to prevent it and worry later about what might have been.

Although President Kennedy, in his many discussions of the Cuban problem, usually directed his remarks toward "satellites," he did not always do so. On April 23, 1963, he said at a news conference:

"I think the members [of the Organization of American States] have made it very clear that Marxist-Leninism and the Soviet presence is not a matter which is acceptable to the people of the Hemisphere."

### 1961 Warning Recalled

And on April 20, 1961, just after the Bay of Pigs disaster, he addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington and laid down a policy that appears exactly to cover the United States' actions last week in the Dominican Republic.

After denying any intention of invading Cuba with American troops, he warned:

"Let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible. Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of non-interference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their

commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are the security of our nation.

"Should that time ever come, we do not intend to be lectured on 'intervention' by those whose character was stamped for all time on the bloody streets of Budapest."

President Johnson, in his

speech Sunday night, pointed out that the Dominican revolution was before the O. A. S. Peace Committee on April 27 and the full O. A. S. Council on April 28. It was late on the 28th that he sent the marines to Santo Domingo to protect American lives.

Mr. Johnson said on April 30 that there was evidence of outside influence among the rebels. By Sunday night, May 2, he was saying that the revolution "was taken over and really seized and placed in the hands of a band of Communist conspirators."

The Organization of American States by then had taken no action to stop a possible Communist take-over of the Dominican Republic. Thus, all the elements postulated by Mr. Kennedy four years earlier were present, and Mr. Johnson's build-up of American troops in Santo Domingo was his way of meeting what Mr. Kennedy had called the nation's "primary obligations" of national security.

From still another point of view, Mr. Johnson's willingness to rise above "the inter-American doctrine of noninterference" in this manner was not a "new doctrine."

The Administration has pointed to Cuban-trained "Castroites" in Santo Domingo. On Sept. 13, 1962, President Kennedy had this to say:

"If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this Hemisphere... then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies."

Thus, it is hard to define anything that could be called a new "Johnson Doctrine." In fact, high Administration officials here are saying privately that the action in the Dominican Republic cannot be taken as a guide to any and all Communist threats in the Americas.

Government had broken down almost totally in the Dominican Republic, greatly increasing the Communist opportunity there.

Moreover, in some Hemisphere countries, even a determined Communist uprising, or subversion effort, might well be dealt with forcefully by that country's own government. Or Communist strength might be met by clandestine United States tactics, as in Guatemala in 1954.